

Application No.: 10/803,113
Docket No.: UC0223USCIP

Page 6

REMARKS

The above amendments and the below remarks are responsive to the Office Action, dated June 29, 2005, entered in the above referenced pending application. A summary of the amendments to the specification and claims is provided below.

The pending claims are Claims 1-7.

Each of the Examiner's rejections is addressed separately.

The Specification

The specification was amended to recite the claim of priority to the provisionally filed application directly within the specification. No new matter is introduced.

The Abstract

The abstract was amended to change the word "comprising" to "including". No new matter is introduced.

The Claims

Claims 2, 4, and 7 were amended to change the *Markush* language from "selected from" to "selected from the group consisting of". No new matter is introduced.

Claim 6 was amended to recite a fluorinated polymeric sulfonic acid. No new matter is introduced.

Abstract

The abstract was objected to because of the word "comprising". Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to the abstract submitted herein has overcome this objection, and request that it be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 4, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of improper *Markush* language. In order to further prosecution, the claims have been amended to recite "selected from the group consisting of". No new matter is introduced. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome by the amendment. The Examiner has further stated that Claim 6 fails to further limit Claim 5, from which it depends. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion, but made the proposed amendment to aid in the further prosecution. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/803,113
Docket No.: UC0223USCIP

Page 7

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-6 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 of copending Application No. 10/669,577. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be suspended pending allowance of the subject matter of pending Claims 1-6. Appropriate amendments will be made once Notice of Allowance is obtained.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,716,550 ("*Gardner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is the only independent claim and Claims 2-7 depend thereon. Thus, Claim 1 is discussed below.

In particular, the subject matter of Claim 1 is directed to a composition comprising at least one polyaniline and at least one *colloid-forming* polymeric acid. In contrast to the invention of pending Claim 1, at most *Gardner* discloses a complex of a polymeric polyaniline and a protonic acid or oxidizing dopant (*Gardner* at col. 11, lines 42-43), which may or may not be polymeric, *in combination* with a castable freestanding-film-forming binder. *Gardner* does not disclose the use of at least one colloid-forming polymeric acid with a polyaniline, as is required by the pending Claim 1.

In particular, most the protonic acids specifically disclosed by *Gardner* are non-polymeric acids. See, e.g., *Gardner*, col. 11, lines 64 to col. 12, lines 44, and the fact that the R¹ of *Gardner* as listed at col. 12, lines 22-37, are non-polymeric. *Gardner* provides limited "alternatives" to its non-polymeric protonic acids, but the only polymeric acids specifically disclosed by *Gardner* are those with having "a plurality of sulfo groups" and that provided that such acids have the desired solubility in the binder and/or solvents. See *Gardner* at col. 12, lines 37 and 44. The specific polymeric acids taught by *Gardner* are sulfonated polystyrene, sulfonated polyethylene and p-polystyrenesulfonic acids. See, e.g., *Gardner* col. 12, lines 38-41. But, *Gardner* provides no teaching or suggestion as to whether *Gardner* formula II polymeric acids, or its sulfonated polystyrene, sulfonated polyethylene and p-polystyrenesulfonic acids are or could be colloid-forming as required by pending Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the only mention of "colloidal materials" (see *Gardner* column 14, lines 42-46) is a reference to the nature of the castable freestanding-film-forming binders of *Gardner*, not any polymeric acids, let alone a colloid-forming acid.

Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Gardner* of the subject matter of pending Claim 1 and thus, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to all of the pending claims.

The following additional remarks are provided to aid in the understanding of the

Application No.: 10/803,113
Docket No.: UC0223USCIP

Page 8

Gardner reference. First, *Gardner* does not teach or suggest halo substituents on the polymer acids that *Gardner* does describe. In particular, *Gardner* suggests "halo" substituents for only two aspects of the *Gardner* complex: (1) non-polymeric protonic acids R^1 moieties in *Gardner's* formula II (see, e.g., *Gardner*, at column 12, lines 35-37 & *Gardner* claim 11); and (2) representative R groups on the *Gardner* aniline (*Gardner* column 10, line 22). Neither of these aspects of *Gardner* is a teaching or suggestion of a halo on any polymeric acid, let alone a colloid-forming polymeric acid.

Furthermore, in contrast to the specific teaching of the halo substituents as set forth above, the discussion of the *Gardner's* polymeric acid R^1 moieties (at *Gardner* column 12, lines 38-44), does not include or suggest any substituent groups for the R^1 , let alone a halo substituent. Thus, in view of the specific teachings of a "halo substituent" with respect to the above mentioned two aspects of the *Gardner* complex and the lack of a similar teaching with respect to the suitable polymeric acids of the *Gardner* complex, it is respectfully submitted that the total reading of *Gardner* actually teaches away from the use of a halo substituent on a polymer acid in the *Gardner* complex. And, *Gardner* is certainly not a teaching or suggestion of the colloid-forming polymeric acids as set forth in pending Claims 5 and 6.

Even if one were to select a halo substituent for the polymeric acids of *Gardner*, such a selection still does not result in Applicants' invention of Claim 1. As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Gardner* to select a colloid-forming polymeric acid.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that since *Gardner* does not teach or suggest the composition as recited in Claim 1, any of the dependent claims 2-6, or the composition of Claim 1 and additional materials of the *Markush* group as listed in pending Claim 7. Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/803,113
Docket No.: UC0223USCIP

Page 9

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the above referenced pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-7 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


MARY ANN CAPRIA
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Registration No.: 32,659

Telephone: (302) 992-3749

Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: 9/30/2005